

Javian Pantoja

Internship

May 8, 2020

The Hope Case Study

In the Shepard Fairy case where he designed a hope poster for Obama during presidential election. During that time, he came out with a work that is considered to be a fair use, considering what he has made. But I agree with Shepard Fairy that the photo he used for his work is considered fair use and he shouldn't be sued for his action.

During the 2008 presidential election, a poster was made out of Obama, signifying people expects of Obama to bring hope to people around the world. Those who are unsatisfied with his presidential works might take the poster as a sarcasm or mockery. His idea is very intersubjective and dynamic meaning that can be reinterpreted in his own way that no ever did. I think that the Obama "Hope" poster is in fact is a good example of fair use. Shepard Fairy didn't copyright Obama's Picture, but he simply used it as inspiration to create his master peace.

It is to say that the image from Fairy is an idealize of Obama, that gazing look, the lines, colors and the fall of the light with brighter and darker sides to show almost like a messiah looking at the people or sky, that can help the others out. Fairley's ability to influence people through his monologues meaning the color choices he made and how his design impact others and the presidential election for Obama.

Illustration brings creativity or something simple. The freshness and a one of a kind perspectives to the plan of contact. It assists with conveying both basic and complex message while improving a plan through the vision or idea. The work must be unique and imaginative to be copyrightable. Inventiveness implies that the work wasn't duplicate it from another person work. Which he did and made the expectation banner for Obama presidential battle. Along these lines, the "Reasonable use" grants somebody to utilize work with-out consent for a reason that is essentially not going to contend with or harm the market for the work, for example, utilizing a structure in an article about the designer profession.

Fairy has said that his decision to create a portrait of Obama stemmed from Fairey's feeling that Obama's "power and sincerity as a speaker would create a positive association with his likeness. Fairy have used different google Images search engine for the hunt for available photographic portraits of Obama that he uses for the hope poster. Which he searches different one but he found one that he like and he used it for his design.

Anything that goes into the internet in my opinion is consider fair use because everything in the internet anyone can used unless they have a copyright text on the image. So, if the image didn't have anything on there it's consider that anyone can use it and if the person wants to give credit for using his photo he can but he doesn't have to. If so called the image he found on the website did have an copyright logo or texts on, then he have to pay the person to use that image for his creation/design. Only certain photos in the world are consider fair use unless you use it right, but if you didn't use the

photo right and it didn't change anything about it, you would get sued for a large amount of money.

But due to the copyright, I agree that Fairy had fair use for that photo he used. If the photo was taken by freelance photographer Mannie Garcia that work with AP. Now the photo of Obama could have had a copyright texts on it to show that AP owns that's photo to prevent someone from using it and if they did, they have to pay for that photo. Which AP did not do, so in fact the photo was fair use to use anyway as possible and he didn't have to use that photo?

Fairy on the other hand, set out to make an image for a political campaign: something that would inspire people to support a presidential candidate and symbolize their hope. So, what he did was he found an opportunity photo of Obama looking away, which he found and continued with his process of designing. Later on the year he was later sued due to copyright infringement, which mean he has used the photo without permission and was fine \$25 thousands. But I believe on his term that it was fair game for using a photo of Obama.

I believe that he has shouldn't have been fine for his action. Like I once said in one of my paragraphs that if a photo has come type of text or logo etc, he has to pay to use that photo and if the photo doesn't have it then it fair use. But he could also give credit to the person that has upload the photo as well. Do to my experience for copywriting is that if I use a photo anywhere else you could give credit but it's likely to do it so you're not stealing the photo but since it's consider school work I don't have to since I'm not publishing anything in the world.

But modifying original photo doesn't include copyright infringement because the original photo was edited in a way that doesn't represent the original photo that was taken. To not get sued for copyright infringement that the work from the original photo has to be different from the photo with your own design and twist to the photo.

As you can see about the Shepard Fairey case that he was sued for copy rights, meaning that that photo he has used wasn't so different to the original photo and got fine \$25 thousand. But for fair use, if the original photo and the Illustrated photo is different then there is no copy right infringement because the illustration is different and its fair use.

<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Reflections-on-the-hope-poster-case-Fisher-Cost/cb6c3e2746dd7e2d4d8575764f42646ccba46366>

<https://www.scribd.com/document/47556757/Guide-to-copyright-1-MB>

<https://www.ukessays.com/essays/cultural-studies/hope-poster-by-shepard-fairey-cultural-studies-essay.php>

<https://www.google.com/amp/s/wordpress27649.wordpress.com/2018/04/13/visual-analysis-of-shepard-faireys-hope/amp/>